

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 16 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10-12 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, and 16 have been rejected and claim 3 has been allowed. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 and 16 were indicated as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1, as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed that the inventors had possession of the claimed features. The Applicants note that since claim 3 was indicated as allowable in the Office Action Summary as well in paragraph 7 of the present Office Action, it is presumed that rejection of claim 3 under § 112, paragraph 1, was an inadvertent error. With respect to the remaining claims, the Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection and submits the present specification clearly conveys to one of ordinary skill in the art the disputed claim terms of claim 1. In particular, the present application indicates in the paragraph 3 of page 4 and in the paragraphs 2 and 3 of page 9 that explains chronicle storage of persistent data alternately in a first FEPROM and next in a second FEPROM. Notwithstanding, claim 1 has been amended herein and the changes to this claim are believed to obviate this rejection.

Claims 1-2, 4-13, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,582). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that Johnson et al. discloses all of the elements of claim 1 except for direct connection of a lookaside buffer to permanent memory. The Office Action asserts, however, that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Johnson et al. to directly connect data storage into the lookaside buffer in order to facilitate faster access. In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that Johnson discloses all of the elements of claim 1 and that it would have been obvious to modify Johnson to achieve all of the claimed features.

In particular, claim 1 features “permanent memory connected to the buffer, the permanent memory having at least first and second storage units, into which the persistent data is alternately written.” In contrast, Johnson discloses storage of persistent data in the data storage 206, as illustrated in Fig. 2 with two units labeled “backing store.” As taught by Johnson et al., a “virtual storage manager allocates and deallocates portion of the SAS 204 to portion of the data

storage 206 as needed.” (See column 10, ll. 35-37). This teaching, however, is not tantamount to a teaching that persistent data is alternately written to the two “backing stores” in data storage 206. Moreover, no specific teaching or suggestion is given in Johnson nor presented in the present Office Action explicitly or implicitly evincing that Johnson teaches this function. Rather, the Office Action merely refers to Fig. 2 without any explanation. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present Office Action has not established that Johnson teaches or suggests all of the elements of claim 1 and that Johnson indeed does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements.

Moreover, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to directly connect the data storage of Johnson into the lokaside buffer contained within the virtual address translator 210. In particular, the virtual address translator 210 is disclosed as translating SAS addresses to native addresses of the data in the page cash when requested by client objects. (See, column 10, ll. 37-40). There is no teaching or suggestion that persistent data is actually written to the virtual address translator 210. In contrast, claim 1 features “a buffer into which is written persistent data.” Furthermore, because the virtual address translator 210 is not utilized in the function of actually storing persistent data, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to “directly connect” the lookaside buffer within the translator 210 to the data storage 206 because it simply would not make sense to do so. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that it would have not been obvious to modify Johnson in the way asserted in the present Office Action to thereby arrive at the claimed features, irrespective of any assorted motivation.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record and request withdrawal of the present rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 2, 4-13, and 16, the Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their ultimate dependency on claim 1.

In light of the above comments, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: November 6, 2003